

# **Humanist** *World Digest*

VOL. 24, No. 4  
NOVEMBER, 1952

1011 Heinz Avenue  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c  
\$1.00 A YEAR

## **The Security of Our Freedom**

By Rev. Dr. George Hedley

•

## **TVA Before and After Election**

By Dallas McKown

•

## **Humanism Is Religious**

By George E. O'Dell

•

## **NEWS AND VIEWS** (Post-Election)

### **THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM**

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

# TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfilment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thralldom of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

# HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

(Successor to WELCOME NEWS)

A Quarterly of Liberal Religion

Anga Bjornson, Editor. Editorial Associates: Franz Wertgen, Felix J. Fraser, Victor Yarros. Entered as Second-Class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: Anga Bjornson, chairman; Edward L. Ericson, vice-chairman; John Morris, and E. O. Corson, Managing Editor. Subscription Rate: \$1.00 per year: Advertising Rates: As space is available, classified ads are 10c a word. Address to Business Manager. Vol. 24, No. 4, October, November, December, 1952. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest (published by the Humanist World Fellowship), 1011 Heinz Ave., Berkeley, Calif.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest. Permission granted for reproduction of original articles when proper credit is given.

---

## THE SECURITY OF OUR FREEDOM

By REV. DR. GEORGE HEDLEY

Chaplain and Professor of Sociology and Economics,  
Mills College, Oakland, California

Delivered at a public meeting sponsored by the Berkeley Committee on Security and Freedom, held at the Berkeley High School, California, May 15, 1952, and as the address of the evening at the annual meeting (October 17) of the Northern California Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union.

What do we mean by "security"? What do we mean by "freedom"?

It is obvious that these words do not mean the same things all the time everywhere. Radicals and reactionaries both assert their devotion to freedom, as do those milder people called liberals and conservatives. By some, freedom is thought of essentially as *laissez-faire* capitalism, to some it is rather a matter of independent thinking, for some it seems to mean no other than a monopoly of control on one's own side.

Security, too, has manifold and often contradictory meanings in our time. As national security, everyone approves it; as guaranteed economic security, many now discount it; as security of spirit, multitudes are seeking it but not all of them find it. I assume that your Berkeley committee sees both freedom and security as values that should be sought and maintained; but before we can agree to this we must be sure what kind of freedom, and what kind of security, we are talking about.

In brief, I would suggest that our concern is with full personal freedom to think, to speak, and to live; and that the security we seek is the assurance that these historic freedoms of the American people shall be preserved alike from external suppression and from inward collapse. Thus my first proposition for this evening is that **What we seek is that our freedom shall be secure.**



I scarcely need elaborate the dangers that now confront the security of freedom throughout the world. All through the vast region from the Elbe to Vladivostok, from the Baltic to the Danube basin, freedom as we know it and love it is flatly denied. The religious fundamentalism of Marxist dogma operates through a mighty and rigid political state. A minority voice scarcely can be heard through the overpowering blare of the Stalinist loud-speakers; and when dissent does make itself vocal it is promptly suppressed, and the dissenter in most cases liquidated.

It is the Communist threat to world freedom that is the major problem for the free peoples today. It is to block that threat that we have set up the North Atlantic Treaty organization, that the United States has given economic aid by such means as the Marshall Plan and the Point 4 program; that United Nations troops have fought these two long and inconclusive years in Korea. This defense of our freedom, these efforts for its security, no one of us proposes for a moment to relax. If our freedom is to be secure, the Russian denial of freedom must be at every point denied.

But let us recognize that it is not only abroad, and internationally, that our historic freedoms now are visibly endangered. In the very effort to ensure that we shall be safe from the Soviet type of tyranny, we have developed a frightened sort of counter-tyranny in our own midst. Not only are numerous Americans afraid that the adherents of Marxism will poison the public mind. Many of us have gone on from that so much to distrust any minority judgment or utterance at all, that we have thought to save American freedom actually by denying it. Loyalty oaths, committee investigations, FBI clearances, scatter-gun denunciations: in all of these we find symptoms of the fear that has beset us as a nation. Need we be thus afraid? And if rightly we are afraid, have we chosen the best way to remove the causes of our fearing?

It is, after all, freedom that we would preserve. I submit to you therefore, as a second point in my argument, the proposition that **Only freedom as means can give us freedom as end.** It is precisely the Russian story that demonstrates the inevitable product of tyranny in tyranny. Under the Marxist formula the dictatorship of the proletariat was supposed to issue in the formation of a classless society, and so in the "withering away of the state." So far from achieving this, the Soviet Union has become

ever more elaborate in its governmental structure and ever more absolute in its controlling of every aspect of human life.

From the vicious cycle of dictatorship there can be no escape; for each new gain of power demands still further extensions of power to make it good. If the party is effectively to control the state, the leaders must be sure that they control the party. At the same time, the lesser party functionaries can demonstrate their complete loyalty only by enforcing total conformity on all those within their reach. Thus the denial of freedom denies freedom ever more, until freedom is dead indeed.

The real tragedy of the Soviet system is not only that it denies freedom of expression. It is that ultimately it leaves nothing but the official dogma for anyone to express. For thirty-five years now in Russia there has been no free access to information. The period has been shorter for the other countries in the Communist area of control, but for each it is steadily lengthening. For seven years now, in Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria, for five in Hungary, for four in Czechoslovakia, for three in China, no one has been permitted access to the data from which thinking might be done. To restore freedom of utterance in those countries today would mean but little immediately, for what would their people have to utter?

We in America are, thank God, in no such situation yet. But the danger already is here, if we think to make our chief means to security the silencing of all dissent, if we suppose we can get rid of subversives by ourselves subverting the very freedoms we have set out to preserve. That brings me to my third proposition, which is that **Freedom includes minority rights as well as majority rule.**

At the moment I am less concerned with abstract, philosophical freedom than I am with the practical effects of our possible procedures. There is, of course, the safety valve theory of freedom, a theory that does make some sense: namely, that letting people let off steam is a wonderful safeguard against their exploding in violence. Do you know the story of the London bobby who heard a Hyde Park orator advocating the immediate blowing up of Buckingham Palace?

The officer adjusted his chinstrap and stepped forward. "Now lydies an' gents", he said, "let us do this 'ere in decency an' in horder. Them as is goin' ter blow up th' Palace step hover 'ere ter th' left; an' them as is not so minded step ter th' right."

Needless to say, the bobby thus disposed of the whole project.



And they who would silence a minority, any minority, would be well advised to remember that rigid suppression often issues in expression of the most extreme sort. This is the story of the French and the American and the Russian revolutions; and neither Louis XVI nor George III nor Nicholas II might have been so rigorously treated had they and their advisers been less rigorous in their own exercise of power.

But a wiser sort of amused tolerance, while undoubtedly more practical than is any panicky repression, is not in itself a sufficient argument for freedom of speech. The real reason, the only compelling reason for freedom, is that it is only by allowing people to speak that we possibly can profit by what they may say. If the majority always should silence the minority, how might we ever achieve the growth that comes by change?

There was a time when the Christians were a very small minority in the Roman Empire. There was a time when the Lutherans were a tiny minority in the universal Church. There was a time when the proponents of independence were only a handful of men in the American colonies. There was a time when those who hated human slavery, and proposed to abolish it, were a negligible and despised coterie in the United States. There was a time, as recently as 1948, when the Republicans, much to their surprise, turned out to be only a minority of the American electorate. Since most of us belongs to most of these former minorities: Republican, abolitionist, American, Protestant, Christian: we scarcely are in a position to argue for the silencing of minority opinion as a general rule.

But allowing a minority to speak does not necessarily mean that we are under any obligation to let the minority have the field all to itself. We who would grant freedom to others ought by every means to claim and use equal freedom for ourselves. My fourth proposition therefore is that **Freedom includes the freedom to disagree and to contend.**

Specifically, I believe in letting Communists speak, and operate a political party, and run for office, and argue as always they do for the policies of the Soviet Union. But because I disagree with Marxist economics, and distrust Communist veracity, and hold Communist tactics in profound moral contempt, and love this country of my adoption with a passionate love, I demand for myself the right to assail Communism and all its works with all the power that is in me.

It is because I am convinced that Marxism is illogical that I

am sure it can be defeated in debate. It is because I have found Communists to be very frequently liars that I am convinced the truth will expose their lies. It is because I have observed the techniques of Communist procedure that I think any intelligent and devoted group of believers in freedom can lick them in a fair fight. (Indeed, when we have lost to them, it has been because we have been not intelligent, or not devoted, or neither.) It is because I profoundly believe that the American way is better than the Russian way that I hold we should use the American way to let our pro-Russians exhibit their folly in their own loquaciousness.

Any of you who may belong to the CIO will, I hope, allow me to adduce you as a case in point. There was a time when, as an old line member of the old line AF of L, I myself joined with my I.W.W. friends in referring to you as the Commie-I-O. I think you will agree that that was not an inaccurate designation for your outfit in this San Francisco Bay region only a few years ago. But it is accurate no longer; and you of the CIO beat the Commies in the open field not at all by denying freedom to them, but by out-arguing them as to values, and by out-maneuvering them in parliamentary procedure, and by out-voting them in your elections.

We all would do well to profit by the labor movement's experience and example. Freedom ought of course to be accorded to every child of man; but that means that every child of man is called upon reverently and vigorously to use his freedom to defend the values that he treasures, and to support the causes in which he believes. If really you and I treasure freedom, if really we believe in its worth, we shall not doubt the power of our very freedom to defeat all proponents of tyranny on every front where we and they may meet.

Already I have expressed in substance what now I want to state categorically: my fifth and final proposition. It is that **The truly free spirit always will be secure, for it never can be afraid.** It is the denier of freedom who never can be free, for always he is announcing his fear that he cannot maintain his position on its own merits.

What is there for you and me to fear? Nothing but the truth. And if we are persuaded that the truth is ours, we can be afraid of nothing. That does not mean that we are permitted to let the lie pass undisputed, the sophistry persist unchallenged. What



I am pleading for is that we who believe in freedom shall use our freedom to maintain freedom. What I am sure of is that freedom is sure to win if free men and women really believe in it, really defend it, really employ it.

This great nation, conceived in freedom, will not lose its freedoms if it uses its freedoms aright. It can afford argument, for it can argue cogently. It can afford dissent, for always it has learned by discussion. It can vanquish all proponents of tyranny, not by shutting their mouths but by exposing the fallacies that those mouths so loudly utter.

How may our freedom be made secure? By no other way than the way of freedom itself. It will not be an easy way. It will demand of us hard thinking, and clear speaking, and vigorous action. But the way of freedom is the only way that finally can refute the specious arguments of tyranny. Not by suppression of those who disagree, but only by the power of the truth, can our freedom be preserved and our way of living be made secure.

Who should be afraid? The Communist well may be: though not of committees, and courts and prisons. These indeed sometimes have helped his cause, and may help it still further; for all too often they have led bystanders to think there might have been something in what the Communist might have said if he had been given the chance to say it. What the Communist ever must fear is the whole truth: as ever he demonstrates by his own eagerness to suppress it.

For clarity's sake let me repeat the line of my argument here. Number one: What we seek is that our freedom shall be secure. Number two: Only freedom as means can give us freedom as end. Number three: Freedom includes minority rights as well as majority rule. Number four: Freedom includes the freedom to disagree and to contend. Number five: The truly free spirit will be secure, for it cannot be afraid.

Let the Communist talk, then; and we shall talk too. We who are convinced that he is wrong shall have no doubt of our power to expose his lies and to defeat his purposes. Our goal is freedom, and freedom is our means to the goal. It is in our conviction of the truth, in our devotion to the truth, that our security will live: and it can live no otherwhere, no otherwise.

John Milton said it in another connection in his *Areopagitica*, but he said it for all time. And as my time ends I ask you to hear John Milton's word to us:



Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?

\* \* \*

## **TVA BEFORE AND AFTER ELECTION**

By **DALLAS McKOWN**

Dallas McKown is a free-lance writer and editor with a number of years' experience on farm magazines, trade papers, and guidebooks. He was born in Texas, was educated in Colorado, and he now lives near TVA's Hiwassee Dam in North Carolina.

In its twentieth year, TVA is in the midst of a tremendous steam-electric power plant construction program, without equal in any part of the nation. It is rushing to completion five huge plants scattered from one end of the Tennessee River Valley to the other. In a few weeks two other plants will be started. By 1956, when all are finished, they will much more than double TVA's present power capacity of about 3.8 million kilowatts.

In terms of electric capacity, and size and speed of the highly organized intricate construction effort, the steam plant program is impressive—much more impressive, in fact, than any phase of the dam and hydroelectric power work that TVA started with Norris Dam in 1933 and carried on with towering Fontana Dam in World War II to supply power for airplane aluminum.

Unfortunately, a steam power plant is not as dramatic as a dam. The steam plant may be somewhat awesome with its monolithic steel chunks of squat machinery, its steam pressures of 1,800 pounds to the square inch (decried as impossible by engineers a few years ago), and its candy-kitchen cleanliness. But it doesn't seem to have what it takes to stir the human soul.

You stand on a hill above a TVA dam and see a great river sweeping along in a green valley. The river is interrupted by an architecturally beautiful barrier—man-made. A broad placid lake lies back of the dam. Underneath the structure, out of sight, the water is being gathered into the turbines. You hear a low hum, feel a suggestion of slight trembling in the massive concrete as the tamed but powerful water passes through.

Far below, emerging from the turbines, the water boils up whitely in release, then calms down and flows on again as a peaceful, living river, toward another dam and powerhouse.

The most inarticulate concrete puddler or form carpenter felt something of a thrill as he helped to tame the river by building the dam. Neither he nor the visitor at the finished project gets the same sense of drama at a steam power plant, even though it is highly efficient and sends more power surging out to farms, cities, and defense plants.

The people of the Tennessee Valley wondered about the future of TVA in the event of a Republican victory.

The casual visitor to the dams sees no cause for alarm. There the great structures are—permanent, controlling the once-destructive floods, fitted together into an important transportation channel, and supplying the electricity in an 80,000 square-mile area with five million people. Surely, not much change can be made in this physical plant.

However, thoughtful Valley leaders who have seen the creation of the river control system become the core of vast economic changes in the seven-state TVA area viewed the prospect in a different light. Some of them will remind you that in March, 1952, Rep. Rains, of Alabama, asked a rhetorical question of his colleagues in the House, and got a shocking answer.

Rains was speaking in favor of a public housing bill, and said: "I listened to the gentleman from California say that we ought to sell everything except the battleship Missouri and the Panama Canal . . . **Would you sell the TVA?**" this representing to him the most incredible event he could imagine.

As quick as the reflex of your leg when the doctor taps your knee with his rubber hammer came the shout from the **Republican side of the House: "Yes!"**

That roaring affirmative, representing a long pent-up emotion was frightening to Congressmen who have fought for TVA, and to the Valley people who met TVA with suspicion in 1933 but have since come to recognize it as a keystone of the region's prosperity and welfare.

## II

Even more disconcerting than the spontaneous "Yes!" from the Republican side of the House is a preview of the Congressional committee lineup that TVA would face while seeking its annual appropriations in a Republican Administration.

The chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, an all-important group to agencies like TVA, would be Rep. Dondero, of Michigan, who declared in 1947:



"TVA is now bankrupt and has long been bankrupt," a fact he continued, that had "long been concealed and cloaked by a cunningly devised, devious and spurious system of accounting . . . in a manner that has met with the condemnation of the General Accounting Office itself."

What does it matter that Dondero's denunciation came in the same year that GAO's director of government corporation audits testified before a Congressional committee:

**"TVA probably has the finest accounting system in the entire government and probably one of the best in the entire world . . . There is no private enterprise in this country that has any better."**

If you turn to the prospective chairman of the Senate's Committee on Public Works in a Republican Administration, you find the same opposition to the TVA idea. Senator Harry Cain (defeated) of Washington, would be Committee head. His attitude can be summed up in a stand he took against a Missouri Valley Authority in 1952:

**"Federal regional authorities are really an excuse for the Federal government to take over the power industry by subterfuge."**

There is no point in compiling a roll-call of Republican Congressional sentiment about TVA. You have only to look back to the GOP-controlled Eightieth Congress, which strung along with private power lobbyist Purcell Smith and shouted down funds for the construction of the Johnsonville steam plant—an action rescinded by a later Congress under the shadow of a world war threat.

Republican Congressmen who fought TVA from 1948 to 1952 did so without having a platform plank to stand on, for the party program in 1948 contained only the sweet-sounding statement that "We favor progressive development of the Nation's water resources for navigation, flood control and power, with immediate action in critical areas."

By the time of the 1952 Republican convention in Chicago, however, the GOP Congressional thesis that valley authorities were devilish socialistic schemes jelled into an official platform statement:

**"We vigorously oppose the efforts of the National Administration to establish all-powerful Federal socialistic valley authorities."**

Possibly lest this be considered by voters as a purely negative approach, the platform also stated:

"We favor greater local participation in the operation and control, and eventual local ownership, of Federally sponsored reimbursable water projects."

No matter what reservations Eisenhower may have about some of the platform planks adopted at the convention which nominated him, he apparently favors the foregoing remarks about water control projects.

While the convention was in progress, newspapermen from the TVA region interviewed the General who had not commented on TVA during its twenty years of existence as perhaps the world's best-known example of resource development.

During the Chicago interview he was asked, "Would you sell large projects like the Bonneville Dam to individual states?" Eisenhower replied, **"I don't know. You have asked me something I can't answer."**

"I do believe this: I believe that the closer to home you can keep responsibility and authority about all of these projects, the better . . . I want to limit the federal government's participation."

When the Republican foes of TVA are debating specific TVA measures in Congress, they name names; they call their shots when they shoot at this pioneer valley development agency. In election periods, however, and in statements that purport to represent the whole party, you often have to look a long time to see whether they mean TVA, or are merely attacking an extension of the idea.

The unwillingness of the GOP to tip its official hand regarding the one and only existing valley authority—TVA—has made it necessary for Valley residents to find their hope and despair in statements of Republican members of Congress.

Valley people listened eagerly when Sen. Robert A. Taft came to Knoxville in 1951 and said:

"Generally I have been opposed to these Valley authorities, but this one is already in operation and I see no particular need for change in the present set-up." He favored, he told the newsmen, retaining TVA "much like it is now."

Looking for straws to cling to, friends of TVA took hope, but not for long. It began to dawn on leaders of pro-TVA opinion that Taft's phrase, "much like it is now," probably revealed the tactics by which a Republican Administration would change the unique nature of TVA.

With Taft in command as top GOP policy-maker in the Senate—a role Vice Presidential nominee Richard Nixon insists must be



preserved for Taft—there would be no head-on attack on TVA. Such an assault would not win friends for a Republican Administration, and would only serve to rally millions of voters who have been bemused into the belief that TVA is as impregnable and enduring as the post office.

Instead, there would be a gradual stepping up of the tempo of the sniping tactics to which TVA has become accustomed since the end of World War II. There would be few changes in the TVA Act, but there would be more riders in appropriation bills, proposals to transfer various TVA functions to other agencies in the Federal family.

The proud authors of the greatest number of these ham-stringing devices have been Rep. Jensen of Iowa and Sen. Ferguson of Michigan. Many of their amendments have applied to a number of federal agencies, and some exclusively to TVA. Congressmen friendly to TVA have beaten off many of the sneak and flank attacks, but enough have been successful to bring a gradual hemming in of TVA's activities in the past eight years. TVA definitely does not have the elbow room for unified resource development that it once had. The process would proceed much faster if men like Jensen and Ferguson should have majority support in Congress.

And a few years from now, TVA subjected to a stream of measures designed "for its own good," intended only to "regularize" it and "bring it in line with other federal agencies" would have lost the unique qualities that made it a magnet for twenty years for scientific visitors from Peru and Pakistan, Israel and India, Norway and Newfoundland, and the other nations of the world with a deep hunger for knowledge of how to develop their resources without yielding their rights as free men.

All the Republicans would have to do would be to dust off and push through some of the limiting proposals that were shouted into the discard in past sessions of Congress: Put TVA personnel procurement policies under the Civil Service; make all jobs paying \$4500 a year or more subject to Senate approval; limit the amount of travel appropriation so power linemen and engineers would sit at desks instead of climbing towers and inspecting generators; set an arbitrary figure on what TVA can spend for freight charges—in short, take away from TVA all the qualities of free enterprise that it has as a legacy from the Congress of 1933. Gradually; so that the protests of friends of TVA would come to have only nuisance value.

Despite the perennial attacks by the Chicago Tribune, private lobbyists, conservative and reactionary Congressmen, business magazines, construction contractors who resent TVA's building of its own dams, TVA has a tremendous record of accomplishment.

In the fields of multiple-purpose dam construction and operation, river navigation improvement, distribution of electric power to thinly settled areas through cooperatives, stimulation of scientific agriculture (with concomitant erosion control), awakening the need of Southern states for strong local technical agencies, reforestation, attraction of new industries, development of recreation as a major income producer—TVA is the envy of foreigners, and of people living on the banks of the uncontrolled Missouri and other major untamed rivers in the United States.

But, there are still unsolved problems in the Tennessee Valley.

Perhaps the worst thing that could happen to TVA, much worse than a Republican victory in November, would be a flood of major proportions at Chattanooga—and such a flood is a possibility.

For years TVA has been trying to get Chattanooga to provide the rights-of-way for levees that would supplement the protection afforded by TVA dams upstream from the city. The federal government through projects that the Army Engineers can undertake, is willing to build the levees, if Chattanooga provides the land on which they are to be built.

Influential Chattanoogaans, reassured by the series of dams above them, and reluctant to raise the city tax rate another mill, have blocked attempts by more far-seeing citizens to make the levees possible.

### III

TVA has been lucky in two ways.

First, it was born in the Great Depression, when engineers were walking the streets looking for jobs. Thus, the infant resource-development agency had its pick of engineers—hydraulic, electrical, mechanical, and the like. It got the best, and because of the creative satisfaction that taming a river has yielded, many have stayed on.

Also, TVA was set up in the right geographical location. The Tennessee River and its main tributaries were a system of natural waterways without railroads or expensive highways running along every foot of the banks. In more thickly settled Eastern parts of the country, building of as many dams as TVA has built would



have involved prohibitive relocation costs in moving existing transport arteries.

Then, too, the pattern of rainfall favors operation of the TVA system of dams. The rain is rather evenly distributed throughout the year. However, two inches of rain in July, when the trees are in leaf, the fields covered with green crops, and the meadows thick with hay, will yield but little run-off into the river. The same amount of rain in the winter, on sodden ground, much of it bare, may mean trouble.

Fortunately, the winter rains come from the West and Southwest, hitting into the Valley near Memphis or Birmingham, and sweeping across to the east end of the TVA region. Great, basin-wide floods are confined to the period from late December to early April. This storm routine permits planning for operation of the reservoirs in a most effective manner. In some parts of the nation the precipitation pattern is not so easily foreseeable, and operation of a system of dams like TVA's might be considerably more intricate.

To those happy engineering circumstances TVA has added an unsurpassed quality of administration in the public interest. Many of the foreign visitors, who come to see TVA at the rate of about 1,800 a year, have said, in effect:

"In the dealings of the United States with my own country regarding the Point Four program and other forms of technical assistance, we often have a fear of imperialism. If the United States could only guarantee a relationship with us like TVA has with the states and local governments in the Tennessee Valley, your American technical assistance programs would be welcomed without reservation."

Any gradual diminishing of the resource-development capabilities of TVA under an unfavorable national administration would be taken by such visitors as a repudiation by the United States of its own best example to underdeveloped countries.

Such a repudiation is not impossible. In the United States the controversy over TVA still boils as furiously as it did twenty years ago, as furiously as the water thundering out from the turbines underneath the dams.

—The Progressive

\* \* \*

"Sail forth—steer for the deep waters only,

Reckless, O soul, exploring, I with three, and thou with me,  
For we are bound where mariner has not yet dared to go,

And we will risk the ship, ourselves and all."

—Walt Whitman

## A LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Mr. Editor:

Your last issue conjured in me (I won't say, inspired!) the following lines:

### THE NEMESIS

Greatness! that's of the blood,  
and not of the common brood  
of men — of each and every man,  
built on the demagogic plan.

We may increase our size —  
our strength as our rapacity,  
with a stomach capacity  
bigger, even, than our eyes.

But of the greatness, indeed,  
and of moral power,  
there is the direst need  
in this perilous hour!

We need men — truly great,  
even as our forebears were;  
such men whose only estate  
was conscience — and valor.

O well, for politics' skill!  
Let him be clever who will:  
but, we had better beware  
the Nemesis of the Inferior!

For kingdoms rise and fall—  
as history will recall,  
when aristocracy of the best  
succumbs — to all the rest.

As to the best — these are they  
who serve best in their day,  
leaving behind a memorial  
of their good works — at burial.

T. T.



# HUMANISM IS RELIGIOUS

By GEORGE E. O'DELL

Whether Humanism be sharply defined—and thereby limited—or be thought of as loosely descriptive of a paramount occupation with human welfare in our world, the religiously-minded might well emphasize four traits which, perhaps because obvious, are easily taken for granted or merely overlooked. Yet they are important; they bring Humanism into vital relation with religion as a historic fact:

1—All religion is in essence Humanist.

2—Humanism is in its nature religious—that is to say, it involves a venture of faith.

3—Humanism, as religious, is oriented towards the future.

4—Again, like religion in general, Humanism assumes an order in nature, yet believes in the power of ideas.

It may be a distinction useful in its own place which speaks of God-centered religions and Man-centered religions. But actually both varieties arise from man's concern about his own welfare, his own achievement of satisfactions or escape from pain. There may have been saints who declared that they would gladly go to everlasting hell if this would contribute to the glory of God; but, if more than merely rhetorical, they were fanatics. The glory of God, for common people, in so far as they have made a cult of worshiping it, has been that of a being from whom they expected benefits; worship has been a means of ensuring them. The benefits might be either material or spiritual and moral, but items of human welfare they were. It is not only Jacob or Job who would bargain with God either by deeds or submissions, but even the holiest of men and women have presumed a balance, here or hereafter, between human conduct and human destiny, or at least between "atonement" by Jesus and their own final advantage. Throughout the ages man has used for human ends whatever sources of benefit he seemed to discern, whether gods or God, or nature, or as now science and technology. The Humanist is fully involved in the immemorial tradition of the human race.

This is equally so as regards the matter of faith. Humanism uses science and scientific method, the method of ascertaining and verifying facts. But its deepest assumptions are only in part verifiable. It assumes men, as men, to have inherent worth; its

politics, economics, education, religious culture, unless they have eschewed genuine democracy, must imply it. Democracy (which is essentially Humanist) must assume it. Otherwise why treat all, except sentimentally, as in any sense at all "equal?" Equality is a postulate of faith (plus hope and charity!) as regards the future of mankind; and even on the basis of history we cannot demonstrate the truth of any sort of perfectionism, including that modern and rational sort which foresees perfection in some universal way of going rather than in some final goal.

But how much more satisfying than any cut-and-dried certainty! The religious Humanist, appealing to man's conscience, commits him to adventure—the adventure of believing in Man. This does not mean faith in men as hierarchised so that the consciously "superior" enslave without qualms the apparently ignoble and base, but faith in all men as capable of achieving personality and contributing to the general good. Belief of any sort involves effort, whether it concern the Apostles' Creed, or trust in the as yet so often infantile potencies of man, though the latter dogma—for such it is—does not fly in the face of science and known fact.

The third point may seem more platitudinous. But here again it is worth reminding ourselves that Humanism as a working faith is essentially religious. Some fifty-odd years ago that competent civil servant and amateur sociologist, Benjamin Kidd, in his **Social Evolution** created a mild sensation in thinking circles by urging that concentration on the future is the most marked characteristic that religion has. Men are religious when they plan for the future, whether here or hereafter; as social beings they start movements, create institutions, invest charitable funds, to further mundane purposes which they yet know they may not—even will not—live to see wholly achieved. Their spiritual nature is (as Bergson was to say later) creative and is not just anxious to attain a sort of static personal bliss in a life beyond death. Similarly de Gasset, in **The Revolt of the Masses**, an onslaught on modern irreligiousness which has just now been reprinted for extensive sale at a trifling price in America, insists on the same thought. Nothing, he has it, can save religion but a new and self-sacrificing concentration on the future of mankind. All such modes of spiritual craving are Humanist; whether they express it overtly or not they imply our time's new sense of responsibility not to seek supernatural aid but manfully to shoulder—subject to natural law and limitations—the immense burden of saving

our life from inhumanity and winning it for ethical betterment and happy peace.

Fourth, and last, there is the fact that practical Humanism must depend on two linked opposites, natural order and the incursion of mind. The dependability of cause and effect is no new concept. Did not that devout Christian apologist, sixteenth-century Richard Hooker, give us the most glowing panegyric of unbreakable natural law which that law has ever received? Such faith is implicit also in the natural poetry of the Hebrews. As for the power of ideas to rearrange the order of nature, this, even for predestinarians, has been a necessary assumption; otherwise why teach morals? Why denounce wrong-doers and exalt the righteous? The order of human nature equally with the order of the earth, sea and sky, could be, not destroyed, but varied, adapted to fit the needs of men bound together in communities and seeking to survive. Hence science and techniques, harnessed to human welfare; hence idealism exercising the impact of ideas. The newness is not in a break with religion as such; the newness is in enlightenment, even in age-old longings finding expression in ways which may hesitate, without logical warrant, to call themselves religious at all.

---

"My creed is to love justice, to long for the right, to love mercy, to pity the suffering, to assist the weak, to forget wrongs and remember benefits—to love the truth, to be sincere, to utter honest words, to love liberty, to wage relentless war against slavery in all its forms, to love wife and child and friend, to make a happy home, to love the beautiful in art, in Nature, to cultivate the mind, to be familiar with the mighty thoughts that genius has expressed, to make others happy, to fill life with the splendor of generous acts, the warmth of loving words, to discard error, to destroy prejudice, to receive new truths with gladness, to cultivate hope, to see the calm beyond the storm, the dawn before the night, to do the best that can be done and then—to be resigned."

—Robert Ingersoll

\* \* \*

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

—Abraham Lincoln



## NEWS AND VIEWS DUAL SCHOOL SYSTEM HARMFUL

According to Dr. James B. Conant, the distinguished educator who is president of Harvard University, this country is developing a dual system of education which is harmful to American democracy. There are three school systems in the United States—the public schools, with an attendance of approximately 26,000,000; parochial schools, with 3,500,000 pupils, and private schools with an enrollment of 50,000. Addressing delegates of the American Association of School Administrators, Dr. Conant declared that this dual system of education was endangering the American principle of a single public school system. He said that a dual system of schools, with tax money going in some form to private schools, would be harmful to our democratic traditions. He asserted that some critics of the public schools are not honest in their attacks—they want to weaken public school education and sponsor privately controlled schools. He said that hostile critics of the public schools in the United States should be made to "show their colors." Further, he pointed out that we do not have and never have had an established church and schools should serve all creeds. The greater proportion of youth who attend independent schools, the greater the threat to democracy unity. Therefore, to use taxpayers' money to assist such a move is to suggest to American society use its own hands to destroy itself. A dual system serves and helps to maintain group cleavages; the absence of a dual system does the reverse.

Note: Proposition No. 3 on the California ballot just approved by the voters, does just that.

Several pertinent questions come to mind in connection with this subject of a dual school system in the United States. For example, why is the Church of Rome making such strenuous efforts to extend the parochial school system in this country and expending vast sums of money upon the construction of these schools when it is obvious that such funds could be expended to far greater advantage elsewhere. We refer, of course, to countries dominated by that Church, principally in South America and Europe. It is notorious that such countries are cursed with illiteracy—proof that either the Roman schools have failed to educate or that the Roman Church is indifferent to education. The United States is well served by an excellent Public School system, usually acknowledged to be one of the most progressive and com-

prehensive in the world. Other systems, superimposed upon and competitive to it, are superfluous. They are not needed, they represent a duplication of facilities and they represent waste. Why then expend vast sums upon such unwanted schools when there is such a desperate need for education in areas outside United States boundaries? Spain and Portugal, for example, have long led Europe in illiteracy. Here the Roman Church is paramount; here is a crying need for schools. Why are not the millions of dollars now expended by the Roman Church unnecessarily in the United States, duplicating Public School facilities, not diverted to these—and other, equally backward, countries?

—Quoted from The Trestle Board

### RELEASED TIME

Another chapter in the long and somewhat tedious story of Released Time concluded on April 28, when the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a six-to-three decision upholding the New York State Law allowing released time in the public schools. Those who challenged the New York released time law contended that in essence it was no different from the much discussed McCollum case. A majority of the justices disagreed. Justice William O. Douglas, who delivered the opinion of the Court, stated in his opening: "New York City has a program which permits its public schools to release students during the school day so that they may leave the school buildings and school grounds and go to religious centers for religious instruction of devotional exercises. A student is released upon written request of his parents. Those not released stay in the classrooms. The churches make weekly reports to the schools, sending a list of children who have been released from public school but who have not reported for religious instruction. This 'released time' program involves neither religious instruction in public school classrooms nor the expenditure of public funds. All costs are paid by the religious organizations. The case is, therefore, unlike *McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203, which involved a 'released time' program from Illinois. In that case the classrooms were turned over to religious instructors. We accordingly held that the program violated the First Amendment which (by reason of the Fourteenth Amendment) prohibits the states from establishing religion or prohibiting its free exercise." Referring to the arguments presented, Justice Douglas stated: "It takes obtuse reasoning to inject any issue of the 'free exercise' of religion

into the present case. No one is forced to go to the religious classroom and no religious exercise or instruction is brought to the classrooms of the public schools. A student need not take religious instruction. He is left to his own desires as to the manner or time of his religious devotions, if any. There is a suggestion that the system involves the use of coercion to get public school students into religious classrooms. There is no evidence in the record before us that supports that conclusion." In the course of his argument, the Justice stated: "There cannot be the slightest doubt that the First Amendment reflects the philosophy that Church and State should be separated. And so far as interference with the 'free exercise' and an 'establishment' of religion are concerned, the separation must be complete and unequivocal."

Justice Black, dissenting, stated in part: "The sole question is whether New York can use its compulsory education laws to help religious sects get attendants presumably too unenthusiastic to go unless moved to do so by the pressure of this state machinery. The state thus makes religious sects beneficiaries of its power to compel children to attend secular schools. Any use of such coercive power by the state to help or hinder some religious sects over nonbelievers, or vice versa, is just what I think the First Amendment forbids. In considering whether a state has entered this forbidden field, the question is not whether it has entered too far but whether it has entered at all. New York is manipulating its compulsory education laws to help religious sects get pupils. This is not separation but combination of Church and State." Justice Felix Frankfurter stated, in part: "Again, the Court relies upon the absence from the record of evidence of coercion in the operation of the system. If, in fact, coercion were used . . . a wholly different case would be presented." He said that the "diversive controversy" would promptly end if the schools closed down, dismissed classes in their entirety, "instead of seeking to use the public schools as the instrument for security of attendance at denominational classes." Justice Jackson stated: "This released time program is founded upon a use of the state's power of coercion which, for me, determines its unconstitutionality. Stripped to its essentials, the plan has two stages, first that the state compel each student to yield a large part of his time for public secular education and, second, that some of it be released to him on condition that he devote it to sectarian, religious purposes . . . schooling is more or less suspended during the 'released time' so that the nonreligious attendants will not forge ahead of



the churchgoing absentees. But it serves as a temporary jail for a pupil who will not go to church . . . it is as unconstitutional, in my view, when exercised by indirection as when exercised forthrightly. The day that this country ceases to be free for irreligion it will cease to be free for religion—except for the sect that can win political power.”

From the above, it will be seen that the long-debated problem of “released time” is yet far from solution. Vital factors are “compulsion” and “coercion.” Further clarification by the courts will probably be needed and continued controversy is to be expected. Perhaps the happiest, and most common-sense solution would be to abolish “released time” entirely.

Complaints are already heard that too little time is spent in actual study on school premises. “Released time” further restricts those few hours daily in which useful knowledge—essential knowledge—is imparted to a pupil. —from The Trestle Board

\* \* \*

Alexander, Caesar and Napoleon each lived in a very limited world. They conquered all the world they could reach, and then they erected a shrine to the god Terminus. Every individual lives in a limited world. And all the world we should attempt to conquer is our own world. Also, it is well to realize the dictum of Aristotle, that the foes of an army are those within its own camp. That is to say, our enemies are those which lurk in our own hearts—hate, fear, jealousy, sloth, greed, inertia, appetite. To conquer the foes within is a task indeed. But the recipe for peace at home is a foreign war, and so the person who would be strong and efficient should enlist in the University Militant and help conquer the foreign foe, this as a part of the plan for conquering himself.

Choose your division and enlist in the army that is fighting for Human Rights. Don't be a neutral or a camp-follower. Get in the fight and stand back to the wall. Be one of a glorious minority. Be a Greek, and never let yourself be swallowed up by a Persian mob. Dare to stand alone, to fight alone, to live alone, to die alone! Otherwise, you will not live at all—you will only exist.

—Elbert Hubbard

\* \* \*

In the United States there are each minute four persons more than the minute before, each hour 250 more, each day 6,000 more, and each month there are at least 180,000 more people than the month before.

—U. S. Dept. of Agriculture

## IT IS LATER THAN YOU THINK!

The ideals of religious people, both Orthodox and Humanist, by the very nature of their devotions, cause them to be interested in the social gains made for man's advancement and well being on this, their earthly habitat.

Will America keep the meager economic, political and social gains made thus far, especially those made by and since Franklin D. Roosevelt came into the presidency?

Let's look at the picture that unfolded on the night before election, November 3rd. That evening, most of America, and probably a large part of the western world, listened to the radio and television broadcasts of the two major political parties of the country. From 7 p.m. on, the winner, the Republican party supporting Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon, controlled the air waves, except for one-half hour allotted to the loser, the Democratic party supporting Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Sparkman.

Somehow the Republican party had the evidence of unlimited financial support. The source might be most revealing.

On top of that, 98 per cent of the daily press, which is Republican owned, supported Mr. Eisenhower.

Let's look at the probable interests behind all this . . .

The Federal Trade Commission reports, in 1947, **one hundred and thirteen** corporations owned **sixteen billion dollars** worth of manufacturing property, plant and equipment, or forty-six per cent of all such property in the United States. In **fifteen** major manufacturing industries **six** or fewer companies own **two-thirds** of all the capital assets. In **seventeen** industries **one** company owns **one-quarter or more** of all such facilities.

So that you may understand that these are not minor or unimportant industries, let us list a few of them: Steel, aluminum, copper, rubber, glass, meat products, dairy products, cigarettes, distilled liquors, motor vehicles, farm machinery and plumbing equipment. These corporations directly or indirectly supported Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon.

It would seem that it is bad enough to allow **one hundred and thirteen** corporations to control such a large segment of our economic life, but that is not the worst. Less than **twenty large banks and insurance companies** control most of these one hundred and thirteen corporations, and dictate the policies of these industries, through their representatives on the boards of directors of these corporations.

Thus in a large way, by determining the wages of their employees, those boards of directors are in a position to dictate the sort of life that the families of those employees shall live. Do you think that such vast powers over the lives of so many people should be in the hands of the directors of **twenty** large banks and insurance companies, who are responsible solely to the large shareholders of those financial giants?

And of greater importance is how this same process affects the welfare of all our citizens through the masses of so-called public relations experts, as for example: one large eastern company is reported to have a staff of fourteen hundred people in one establishment (who sell no oil) but whose job it is to promote monopoly enterprise, (so-called free enterprise) and to counter-act any opposition, by whatever methods are appropriate to gain their ends. This includes the job to condemn and destroy the faith of the people in any public enterprise established for their economic and social well being. The censorship of school textbooks is another job assigned to groups like this; anything contrary to the interests of monopoly enterprise is stricken out.

When school systems or an individual within one are objectionable they are emasculated through attacks in a friendly press, the radio, the use of some of the patriotic organizations and special organizations, tailor-made to fit the occasion. (See the magazine story, "It Happened in Pasadena," and more than 22 other cities.)

When we realize that each of these one hundred and thirteen organizations have their own so-called public relations organizations to do a similar job to the ones outlined above, we can begin to realize that Herr Goebbels was just a small-town operator in comparison to these Monopoly Enterprise public relation experts and what they have done and are continuing to do with the ordinary man's mind.

The late Samuel Insul who gained fame a decade or two ago as a leader in the private power scandals, instructed his representatives! "Never to discuss issues but always to shout Bolshevik."

These Economic Royalists have, during the war years, ably carried out the instructions of Mr. Insul, up to and including the recent election. The exposure of the \$18,000 contribution to Mr. Nixon from the power, oil and real estate interests, is a minor example of how the monopoly interests operate. It certainly out-



classes all the little so-called Mink coat deals which are used as the little red herring to attract attention of the voters away from the real issues: public power, prepaid medicine, social security, decent labor laws, aid to education and the farmer, etc.

About a hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln made his famous statement that this nation cannot remain half slave and half free. It also cannot remain half democratic and half totalitarian. Either the people are going to use the democratic power which they have in the political field, or big business is going to take over the government, lock, stock and barrel, and the result will be a totalitarian order.

Monopoly enterprise has developed to the position, especially in this country, where it is directly opposed to the public welfare. Unless we face that fact, and do the only intelligent thing, which is to take over the monopoly industries and operate them collectively, for the use and benefit of all the taxpayers, we are headed for industrial chaos which will likely lead to Fascism and war.

And now a word to American labor: that there is more than "wages, hours and working conditions." We would like to suggest that our American labor weigh these words of Michael Stewart, Labor Member of Parliament, as basic ideals for future campaigns. We quote:

"The society we desire has four special characteristics. In it, decisions which affect the economic and social life of the community should be made by the **community for the public welfare**, not by **private persons for their own advantage**. Differences of income should not be so large as to split the nation into groups which cannot understand each other's way of life. Incomes for those able to work should be proportionate to the contribution they make, and opportunity to improve one's position should be equally open to all. And, finally, the community should make human provision, according to need, for those who for any reason cannot be expected to work. The purpose of these economic principles, as of all economic activity, is to provide the material basis for the full development by every individual, of his personality. Personality is developed both by work and by leisure and the education provided by the community should equip the individual for both. The words "every individual" mean exactly what they say: every individual without distinction of color, creed or race."

The Humanist World Fellowship defines religion in terms of

two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious relations. Humanism affirms the **inviolable** dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

Not too many years ago the author of *Mein Kampf* gained the support of the monopoly enterprises of his land. He won an election, too.

Mr. Eisenhower—You, Mr. Nixon and your Congressional majority, without doubt owe your election to the work of the many monopoly enterprises and their effective public relations crews.

American Democracy wonders whither you will lead it?

E. O. C.

\* \* \*

## ECONOMICS

America's concern over the living levels in other nations of the world was discussed recently by Under Secretary of Agriculture Clarence J. McCormick. This concern, he said, is based on humanitarian reasons, but there are practical reasons as well. One, the Under Secretary added, is the economic interest of the United States in other countries another, the national security of America:

In 1951 agricultural exports accounted for 14 per cent of U. S. cash farm income. Every third bale of cotton, every third bushel of wheat, and every third pound of tobacco produced on Americans farms was grown for a market in other nations. The United States exports one-tenth of its edible oils, more than one-tenth of its apples and one-fifth of its peaches.

It is obvious that people of other countries provide an important share of our farm markets. In turn, we depend on those countries for many things we do not produce, or of which we do not produce enough. By buying those products abroad we enable the exporting nations to buy U. S. farm and industrial products. From many nations come such raw materials as bauxite, asbestos, chromite, copper, nickel, tungsten, manganese—that are essential to defense production.

Economic strength among the free countries of the world is a good defense against the spread of communism. On the other hand, where there is hunger, poverty and disease, there is fertile ground for the growth of communism. —Foreign Policy Briefs

## STEVENSON AND THE UBIQUITOUS CAT

State of Illinois  
Executive Department  
Springfield, April 23, 1949

To the Honorable, the Members of the Senate of the 66th General Assembly:

I herewith return, without my approval, Senate Bill No. 93 entitled "An Act to Provide Protection to Insectivorous Birds by Restraining Cats." This is the so-called "Cat Bill." I veto and withhold my approval from this Bill for the following reasons:

It would impose fines on owners or keepers who permitted their cats to run at large off their premises. It would permit any person to capture, or call upon the police to pick up and imprison, cats at large. . . . This legislation has been introduced in the past several sessions of the Legislature, and it has, over the years, been the source of much comment—not all of which has been in a serious vein. . . . I cannot believe there is a widespread public demand for this law or that it could, as a practical matter, be enforced.

Furthermore, I cannot agree that it should be the declared public policy of Illinois that a cat visiting a neighbor's yard or crossing the highway is a public nuisance. It is in the nature of cats to do a certain amount of unescorted roaming. . . . Also consider the owner's dilemma: To escort a cat abroad on a leash is against the nature of the cat, and to permit it to venture forth for exercise unattended into a night of new dangers is against the nature of the owner. Moreover, cats perform useful service, particularly in rural areas, in combating rodents—work they necessarily perform alone and without regard for property lines.

. . . The problem of cat versus bird is as old as time. If we attempt to resolve it by legislation who knows but what we may be called upon to take sides as well in the age-old problem of dog versus cat, bird versus bird, or even bird versus worm. In my opinion, the State of Illinois and its local governing bodies already have enough to do without trying to control feline delinquency.

For these reasons, and not because I love birds the less or cats the more, I veto and withhold my approval from S. B. No. 98.

Respectfully,

ADLAI E. STEVENSON, Governor



## BOOK REVIEW

**JESUS IN HEAVEN ON EARTH.** By Al-Haj Khwaja Nazir Ahmad. Woking, England and Lahore, Pakistan.

We have here another contribution to the ever-fascinating undertaking of separating fact from legend and myth in the life of Jesus. The author is a learned Moslem, son of the founder of the Woking Moslem Mission in England. The "heaven on earth" in the odd-sounding title refers to Kashmir.

The author draws not only on radical Christian scholarship, but also on a number of the New Testament apocryphal books, from which he sifts out bits of probable fact; on a manuscript called "The Life of Saint Issa" (Jesus) discovered in 1887 in a Buddhist monastery by a Russian traveler; and, of course on numerous Moslem sources. On the basis of these vast studies, he gives us a revised story of Jesus which will be a novelty to almost all readers.

Briefly, the story is this: Jesus was born in Galilee, and beside other brothers and sisters had a twin brother Judas Thomas. He was a member of the secret Jewish order of the Essenes. He considered that he had a mission not only to Palestinian Hebrews, but to the "lost tribes." These the author identifies, with some plausibility, with the people of Afghanistan and Kashmir. Jesus visited some of them during the period on which the Gospels are silent. After his crucifixion he revived, through the ministrations of his Essene brethren (the "men in white" of the resurrection stories); appeared several times to his former disciples, and then left them, climbing into a fog on the Mount of Olives, after which he was hidden by a group of Essenes. Thereafter he stayed for a time at Nisibis in Syria, and later journeyed all the way to India, preaching to those of the Ten Tribes. His tomb, in all probability, is located at Srinagar.

The attitude toward Jesus throughout is one of respect. In fact, the author recognizes Jesus as one of the chosen prophets of God, second in rank, of course, to Mohammed. But following the lead of Loisy, Guignebert, Renan, Kirsopp Lake and others, he does a very good demolition job on the stories of the birth, resurrection and ascension.

What shall we think of this very unusual "life of Jesus"? One can see that Christians, even rather liberal Christians, will be ready to utter wails of protest. To the Humanist, naturally, there is no reason whatever for excitement. It would require very spe-

cialized study to determine the standing of this work as plausible history. But to us the question must be highly academic. This reconstruction of a story shrouded in myth and legend seems as acceptable as any other such attempt. If there is good reason to suppose that Jesus died in India, the Humanist will feel no objection.

E. C. Vanderlaan

\* \* \*

## THE SOVIET

The Kremlin's record on slave labor is exposed by the Department of State in a recently lissued booklet, "Forced Labor in the Soviet Union." The 69-page survey shows that slave-labor concentration camps, organized shortly after the Bolsheviks seized power, are an integral part of the Soviet economy and are being extended to its satellites as a widespread practice. Available for 45 cents from the Government Printing Office.

—Foreign Policy Briefs

\* \* \*

## EDITORIAL

A short time ago a news item referred to the Leaning Tower of Pisa, relating to the fact that its foundations were placed on insecure ground. And it has been gradually leaning over more and more since it was constructed. It is said the mathematicians have figured out the rate it is inclining and when it will move past its center of gravity and fall.

It is said a visitor asked one of the residents adjacent to the tower if they were doing anything to stop the impending tragedy, and was informed nothing was being done; they just left it up to a certain saint to take care of.

Well, that's a good way to escape responsibility and also maybe keep you out of the institutions for the mentally deranged, but in the meantime there are many Leaning Towers of Pisa throughout all the world which deserve thought and action, such as:

Not enough good soil and man's misuse of the little he has.  
Too many people for the land and food available.

The evident exhaustion of many natural resources such as iron, lead, zinc, copper, oil, sulphur, the forests, etc.

And worst of all, war and disease, directly based on the above factors that have lead man to fight for selfish existence rather than the brotherhood of man.

Man cannot shunt these problems and their adjustment on

some saint, some far-away god, or some devil. They are his responsibility, here and now. This is a challenging task for all and especially the humanist and his brothers, within and without all world faiths, who want to help rebuild this earth as a garden of Eden, rather than place the job in the hands of the unknown and leave it a desert for the generations of the future. E. O. C.

\* \* \*

## MANAGING EDITOR'S COLUMN

As reaction again starts to gain a foothold, more than ever the objectives of religious Humanism as set forth by the Humanist World Fellowship are the morning star's code of hope for a free world.

The Humanist World Digest is again endeavoring to express these objectives. When you receive a copy and you are not already a subscriber, and want to help the work along, just pin a dollar bill to the coupon below, with your name and address and mail it now for a year's subscription. To our regular subscribers, the Humanist World Digest makes a most acceptable Christmas gift.

---

### SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest for .....years at \$1.00 per year. \$..... enclosed herewith.

Please send information on how to become a member or form a chapter of the Humanist World Fellowship..... (Check)

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

(Please type or print)

Add additional names on a separate sheet.

Mail to: **HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST**  
**1011 Heinz Avenue**  
**Berkeley 2, California**



## INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

**HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

**HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** defines religion in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

**MODERN HUMANISM** seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or ecclesiastical.

**HUMANISM** insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

**HUMANISM** recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradicate racial antagonisms, national jeal-

ousies, class struggles, religious prejudices and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principles of justice, good will and service.

**HUMANISM** seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Institutions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

**HUMANISM** has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

**HUMANISM** accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future — for good or ill. The Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.

John M. Morris  
2441 LeConte Ave.  
Berkeley 9, Calif.